

Message

From: Allen, Elizabeth [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=5E7BDB078EA544C3939CE6E375FDE197-ALLEN, ELIZABETH]
Sent: 11/12/2020 8:47:48 PM
To: Dan Berlin [dberlin@anchorqea.com]; Ally Chopic [achopic@anchorqea.com]; Sanga, Ravi [Sanga.Ravi@epa.gov]; Gardiner, William W CIV USARMY CENWS (USA [William.W.Gardiner@usace.army.mil]; aosullivan@suquamish.nsn.us; Glen St. Amant [Glen@muckleshoot.nsn.us]; dtaylor@suquamish.nsn.us; Brick Spangler [Spangler.B@portseattle.org]; florer.j@portseattle.org; debra.williston@kingcounty.gov; jeff.stern@kingcounty.gov; pete.rude@seattle.gov; allison.crowley@seattle.gov; Merv Coover [merv.coover@erm.com]; Greg Brunkhorst [gbrunkhorst@anchorqea.com]
CC: Lynch, Kira [lynch.kira@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: East Waterway Anthropogenic Background Small Group Meeting #1

All,

At this last meeting I raised the idea of calculating a "KM-capped sum" for PCB congeners as an alternative to the sum of just detected congeners and circulated a memo from the Corps of Engineers on the subject. Afterwards, I remembered that EPA has a dioxin-TEQ calculator based on the same principle. Nonetheless, I spent some exciting time comparing results using the capped sum method versus just the simple sum, and while not comprehensive, it appears the two methods give very similar results. Whether this is due to the robustness of KM statistical methods to being skewed by censored data or the simple fact that the number of non-detected congeners in each sample is relatively small, the end result is the same. And when two methods give essentially the same result, I think the logical choice is to use the simpler of the two. Thus, it appears that just using the sum of detected congeners will work well for our efforts in calculating background.

Happy to discuss further on Monday if anyone wants to, but it may be easier to just move on to other issues...

Elizabeth

Elizabeth Allen
Regional Toxicologist, EPA Region 10
Seattle WA
206-553-1807